No. 5—Vol. II.

The Columbian Balance, and Repository.

" HAIL SACRED POLITY, BY FREEDOM REAR'D !
" HAIL SACRED FREEDOM, WHEN BY LAW RESTRAIN'D !"
BEATTIE.

HUDSON, (New-York) TUESDAY, February 1, 1803.

Original Essays.

Hither the products of your closet-labors bring,
Enrich our columns, and instruct mankind.

FOR THE BALANCE.

EULOGY ON GEESE.

Messrs. Editors,

AFFLICTED, as I sometimes am, with that scorbutic disease, the itch for appearing in print, I have been puzzling my brain, two whole hours, to find a subject for your Balance; when, at last, one was fortunately suggested to me by happening to fix my eyes attentively upon the *pen*, which I was all this time holding in my hand. Among all the subjects, which have engaged the attention of the learned, I do not remember to have seen an eulogy on *geese:* be this, then, my theme; and I doubt not but it will appear, in the sequel of this discussion, that, excepting the cow and the sheep, there is no living creature upon earth, below the rank of man, which is of so much use and importance as the goose. Were I disposed to pursue this momentous subject in its various details, I might quote the story of the Roman historian, which relates that imperial Rome itself was once saved from the fangs of an invading foe by the cackling of a goose; I might expatiate on the delicious flesh of this feathered animal, and especially on the unequalled delicacy of its *down*, that fills the pillow upon which the lovely Chloe lays her head. I might also bring into view the laudable obsequiousness of geese, manifested in their implicitly following their *file-leader;* likewise their scientific skill, which has been evinced in their aerial voyages, sometimes of a thousand miles, without the help of the magnetic needle, or a quadrant. But waving these topics, I shall confine myself to the *quill*, that this creature sheds for the use of man, and which, more than any other instrument, promotes human intelligence.

Hail, Goose-quill! while I am holding thee in my hand, I will describe and proclaim thy worth. But for *thee*, in vain had Faustus invented the art of printing. But for *thee*, fair science would famish, or would be monopolized, as of old, by a few.

The world had been inhabited almost five thousand years, before the inestimable worth of the goose-quill was discovered. The old Romans used a bodkin, made of metal or some other hard substance, for a pen; and they wrote on tables covered with wax. Hence, a famous code of their laws, which were engraven in this manner, was called " *the twelve tables.*" This kind of pen was also used by the ancient Arabians and Hebrews. Job, who was probably an Arabian, and lived as early or earlier than the time of Moses, speaks of graving with " a pen of iron." Jeremiah said, " The sin of Judah is written with a pen of iron, and with the point of a diamond: it is graven upon the table of their heart." This had an undoubted reference to their manner of writing, like the Romans, on waxen tables, and with a pen made of iron or a sharpened piece of a diamond. It was also with reference to this, that Solomon commanded his pupil to write his precepts " upon the table of his heart." That ancient mode of writing, which must have been very inconvenient and slow, was superceded by the use of coloured liquids, or ink; when the pen of iron gave place to the *calamus*, a kind of reed that grew in Egypt, but the best sort, in the southern provinces of Persia. These reeds were split and sharpened to a point. Nor was it till sometime in the seventh century of the christian era, that some happy genius hit upon the discovery of making pens from the quills of geese. This, I scruple not to declare, as it respects the republic of letters, was among the most important discoveries, which have been made by man. Writing has since been rendered unspeakably more easy; and the world has been furnished with a plentiful and cheap supply of pens.

Goose-quills are among the real necessaries of life. They are used in almost every kind of business. They are the props and promoters of science. Without their aid the wheels of business would be obstructed; printing-presses would be struck with a deadly palsy; and the arts and sciences would sink speedily toward the state of savage barbarism. The horse is a fine creature, and much has been said and sung in praise of this noble animal: but were horses to be struck out of existence, it might perhaps be a less calamity to man than the extinction of the race of geese.

Hail, inestimable bird! What are the gay plumage of the peacock, and the delicious notes of the nightingale, in comparison with the value of thy quills!

The eagle, that pierces the clouds and wings his daring flight toward heaven, was,

by the antient Greeks and Romans, conſecrated to Jupiter. The grave and moody-looking bird, the *Owl*, was ſuppoſed to be the favorite of Minerva, the Goddeſs of Wiſdom. In thoſe days of ſuperſtition and idolatry, if the full worth of the gooſe had been known, it might perhaps have been generally worſhipped, as was the Apis or ox, in Egypt.

A KNIGHT OF THE GOOSE-QUILL.

Political.

FOR THE BALANCE.

"Nothing extenuate, nor set down aught in malice."

AN ACCURATE STATEMENT OF FACTS,
CONCERNING
Mr. ATTORNEY-GENERAL SPENCER's
LATE ATTACK
ON THE

Liberty of the Preſs,

IN THIS COUNTY.

Written by a gentleman who was at court during the whole transaction, and who pledges himself that the detail is substantially correct.

[CONTINUED.]

ON Thurſday morning, Mr. SPENCER renewed his motion, that Mr. CROSWELL ſhould be bound, himſelf in 2000 dollars, and his ſureties in 1000 each, upon each of the indictments, to appear &c. & *alſo to keep the peace and be of good behaviour.*

In giving the arguments of the counſel on both ſides, it is not to be expected that every word they ſaid ſhould be copied.—They are given from recollection only. It is not poſſible, in this way, to do juſtice to either of the gentlemen. Some faint idea, however, of their arguments, and of their eloquence, may be gathered from the following ſketches; and whenever it was practicable, their very language is given.

Mr. SPENCER opened the debate, by producing authorities in ſupport of his motion. He cited the ſtatute of the 34th of Edward III, which he ſaid was incorporated in our reviſed code, vol. 1ſt, page 304. He referred particularly to the 6th ſection of the act, which gives every juſtice in the ſtate, power to cauſe to come before them perſons who *be not of good fame*, and to give ſurety for their good behavior; and under the words "be not of good fame" he contended every libeller was found.—To eſtabliſh this propoſition he firſt refered to 4th Black. Com. 256—"Under the general words of this expreſſion, *that be not of good fame*, it is holden that a man may be bound to his good behavior, for cauſes of ſcandal, *contra bonos mores*, as well as *contra pacem*, as for haunting bawdy houſes with women of bad fame; or for keeping ſuch women in his own houſe; or for words tending to ſcandalize the government; or in abuſe of the officers of juſtice, eſpecially in the execution of their office, &c. and other perſons, whoſe miſbehaviour may reaſonably bring them within the general words of the ſtatute as perſons "not of good fame." He next referred to Hawkin's Pleas of the crown, 1ſt vol. page 355, where it is affirmed that the author of an obſcene book may be bound over as a perſon of bad fame, altho' he cannot be puniſhed by law as a libeller. A fortiori, he contended, a libeller was within the words of the ſtatute. He then quoted the third vol. of Burn's juſtice, page 348 and 349, to the ſame effect. And from theſe authorities he contended that Mr. CROSWELL, ſtanding indicted for a libel againſt THOMAS JEFFERSON, could legally be compelled to find ſurety for the peace and his good behaviour.

Mr. WILLIAMS opened the defence.—He began by ſtating, that the queſtion before the court was of as general concern, and of as great importance to the community, as any queſtion ever before diſcuſſed in this country. In his apprehenſion, it was no leſs than, whether the preſs ſhould remain unſhackled, or become ſubſervient to the whims of every magiſtrate; whether, in a free government, free diſcuſſion of public men and public meaſures ſhould longer be tolerated, or our rights, our laws and conſtitution, trampled under foot, and we deprived of the laſt miſerable ſolace of complaining with impunity. It was not ſimply whether HARRY CROSWELL ſhould be deprived of the rights of a freeman. It was not whether one individual ſhould fall a victim to the perſecutions of revenge. Theſe were, indeed, conſiderations of importance; but when compared with thoſe fatal and moſt extenſive miſchiefs, which muſt flow from a wrong deciſion, theſe conſiderations dwindled into nothing.—He enjoined it, therefore, upon the judges, to riſe ſuperior to party prejudices, to baniſh from their minds every bias, and to decide this important queſtion upon the ſolid principles of law and reaſon. He ſaid that, for the purpoſes of this diſcuſſion, certain principles were admitted. 1ſt. That a libel was not a breach of the peace, but *only tends to a breach of it.* 2d. That the truth of a publication cannot be given in evidence as a juſtification of its author. 3d. That a recognizance for the keeping of the peace and for good behaviour, was forfeited by acts which merely tend to a breach of the peace. Mr. CROSWELL, he contended, had been guilty of no crime. He had not broken the peace—nor, in the eye of the court, had he been guilty of any act which even tended to a breach of the peace. He was *merely indicted* for a libel, and the judges could not conſider him as a libeller until a jury of his country had pronounced his publications libellous. No one had ſworn the peace againſt him. No one had the leaſt pretence for ſo doing. He had done nothing, therefore, for which, at common law, he was liable to this recognizance. Mr. WILLIAMS, therefore, contended, that ex-officio, the juſtices had no power to bind him over, either to keep the peace or to be of good behaviour. He ſaid that the Attorney General had placed the queſtion on its true grounds. For the only pretence which the juſtices could have for the exerciſe of this power, was found in the ſtatute of the 34 of Edward III, incorporated in the reviſed code of this ſtate.—The clauſe of the ſtatute cited by the Attorney-General, gave the juſtices power to bind over "ſuch as be not of good fame," to be of good behavior. And within the meaning of this clauſe, he had endeavored to bring Mr. CROSWELL. On this ground, Mr. WILLIAMS ſaid he would meet him. And he was the more willing to do this, as he well knew, and all the county know, that no man, no! not even the public proſecutor himſelf, leſs merited thoſe opprobrious epithets, than the man he was then defending. Mr. CROSWELL, he ſtated, was a young man—induſtrious and reputable. He had juſt commenced his part in the drama of life; and ſubmitting his fate to the fiat of an overruling providence, he had reſolved that his part ſhould be well acted. He had choſen the profeſſion of a printer; and, unawed by the "powers that be," he would perform what he conceived his duty, though his ruin might be the conſequence. There could not exiſt a doubt, therefore, that as to his habit of life, and his general conduct, Mr. CROSWELL was as far from being a ſubject for the application of this clauſe of the ſtatute, as any man in the community.

The only queſtion, Mr. WILLIAMS contended, was whether the *mere indictment* for a libel on an officer of government, is ſufficient to bring Mr. CROSWELL within the words of the ſtatute? To eſtabliſh the affirmative of this queſtion, the Attorney General had reſorted to Engliſh authorities. In anſwer to thoſe authorities, he ſtated, that there was not one preciſely in point. Thoſe which bear hardeſt upon this queſtion, only ſtate, that ſuch perſons as ſpeaks words *tending to ſcandalize the governmenn, or in abuſe of the officers of*

juſtice, might be ſubjects to which the ſtatute will apply.

He contended, that "words tending to ſcandalize the government," could not mean *words repreſenting the particular conduct of a particular officer of government*. If they could, he ſaid that the vicious conduct even of a conſtable, truly repreſented, would ſubject a man, to this recognizance. He alſo contended, that "officers of juſtice" meant judicial officers only.—And, therefore, he inſiſted as theſe indictments charged Mr. Croſwell with writing words deſcriptive of the *particular* conduct of T. Jefferſon, who cannot be called a judicial officer, this authority could not bring him within the meaning of the words in the ſtatute. As to the authority Hawkin's pleas of the crown, he denied, that becauſe the author of an obſcene and ſeditious book, could be bound for his good behaviour, that, therefore, one charged with a libel might. The caſes he ſaid were extremely variant. The firſt was evidently always an offence *contra bonos mores*. The laſt might not be. For, in this very caſe, altho' by the ſtrict application of Mr. Spencer's doctrine, that "the truth cannot be given in evidence," Mr. Croſwell may be convicted of a libel on Thomas Jefferſon; yet, if the charges in his publication are true, the publication of them, ſo far from being *contra bonos mores*, was his ſacred duty, and muſt be beneficial to the Public.

But, ſaid Mr. Williams, every ſentence adduced in ſupport of the motion, is taken from ſome elementary writer. Such writers draw the general outlines of the law, without deſcending to particulars. And on queſtions where ſuch important conſiderations are involved; where the real freedom of the preſs is attacked, and the rights of a free citizen threatened, the court ſhould be cautious, how, by the looſe dicta of *general* writers, they are drawn into a diſcuſſion, which, ſooner or later, they will wiſh to blot from their records. If the principle was ſound, he aſked, why the attorney-general, whoſe ſituation muſt have naturally led him into the widest researches on ſubjects of this nature, had adduced no adjudged caſe to ſupport it?

The time had been, he ſaid, in England, when party raged with violence; when internal commotion ſhook the kingdom to its center, and when the court and bench had united in every art, in every invention, to ſhackle the preſs and quell the murmurs of faction. If this is law, if this principle could be endured, would it not, he aſked, in thoſe times of turmoil and perſecution have been diſcovered? There is, indeed, ſaid Mr Williams, one caſe in which the doctrine advanced by the proſecutor was recognized. He alluded to the caſe of the ſeven Biſhops. Three of the judges declared it the law of England But, in the language of Lord Camden, commenting on this very caſe, "this adjudication only ſerves to ſhew the miſerable ſtate of affairs at the time." It was an adjudication which even in thoſe times of perſecution and uproar was viewed with horror by every honeſt man in that community. And Judge Powel, the only honeſt judge on the bench, entered his ſolemn protest againſt the deciſion. He firmly diſſented and thus reſcued his reputation from that gulph of infamy which ſwallowed his brethren, as Lot reſcued his body from the flames of Sodom. I truſt the time never will arrive, when, in ſpeaking of this very caſe, any one can apply the ſame obſervation to this honorable bench. The inference is ſtrong and irreſiſtable that no ſuch law ever did exiſt in England. But, ſaid Mr WILLIAMS, I will not ſtop here. Altho' the very ground which the public proſecutor has himſelf choſen, totters beneath him, yet I will adduce ſome authorities deciſive of the queſtion. He then produced a book entitled "a digeſt of the law of libels," and from the 41ſt page read the following: "no man can be bound to give ſureties of the peace for theſe reaſons," "because there is no authority or even ambiguous hint in any law book, that he may be bound—becauſe no libeller in fact was ever ſo bound—becauſe no crown lawyer, in the moſt deſpotic times, ever inſiſted he ſhould be ſo bound, even in days when the preſs ſwarmed with the moſt envenomed and virulent libels, and when perſecutions raged with ſuch uncommon fury againſt this ſpecies of offences; when the law of libels was ranſacked every term, when loſs of ears, perpetual impriſonment, baniſhment, and fines of 10 and 20,000 pounds were the common judgments in the ſtar chamber, and when the crown had opened an uncontrolable authority over the preſs." He then cited 2d of Wilſon's reports, p. 160, the King againſt Wilkes. He ſtated the caſe to be, that Mr Wilkes was committed to the tower for a libel, on a warrant iſſued by Lord Halifax Secretary of ſtate. This warrant was the ſame in effect as to all the purpoſes of the preſent caſe as an indictment- Mr Wilkes was brought into the court of King's Bench on a habaes corpus; and there a motion was made that he be recognized to keep the peace and be of good behaviour. This was oppoſed on ſeveral grounds; but his counſel contended that *no man* merely *charged* with a libel, before conviction, could be thus recognized.

That court, altho' diſpoſed favorably to the proſecutor, and oppoſed to Mr Wilkes, were unanimous againſt the motion. And the chief juſtice Pratt, afterwards LordCamden, in delivering his opinion, uſes the following ſtrong and concluſive language:—"*I cannot find that a libeller was ever bound to find ſurety of the peace in any book whatever, nor ever was in any caſe except one*, to wit, the caſe of the ſeven biſhops, where three judges ſaid that ſurety of the peace was required in the caſe of a libel. Judge Powel, the only honeſt man of the four, diſſented; and I am bold to be of his opinion, and to ſay, *that caſe is not law*; but it ſhews the miſerable condition of the ſtate at that time. *Upon the whole, it is abſurd to require ſurety of the peace or bail in the caſe of a libeller*, and therefore, Mr. Wilkes muſt be diſcharged from his impriſonment—whereupon there was a loud huzza in Weſtminſter-hall."

He then read an extract from the ſpeech of Mr. Fox, in the Britiſh parliament, in the year 1791. Enumerating the dangers to which the preſs was expoſed in England, he ſaid, "In the preſent enlightened age, he certainly had no reaſon to fear that previous reſtraints would be attempted to be impoſed on the preſs. The good ſenſe of the times would not brook an *imprimatur* or previous ſecurities of any kind for good behaviour." Hence, he ſaid, it was obvious that in England no magiſtrate would dare to attempt what this court is called on to execute.

Here then, ſaid Mr. WILLIAMS, is an end to the queſtion. To the looſe dicta of elementary writers, I have oppoſed authorities preciſely in point. I have oppoſed authorities which no art, no ingenuity, can evade. And, ſaid he, is this our boaſted liberty and is this the republicaniſm about which we have heard ſo much clamour? Is this "a monument of the ſafety with which error of opinion may be tolerated when reaſon is left free to combat it?" When federaliſm is dead; the ſedition law no more, and *republicaniſm* triumphant, ſhall a *republican* proſecutor dare to urge a reſtraint on the rights of a freeman, on the freedom of diſcuſſion, which no crown lawyer, in the moſt deſpotic times which England has ever known, ever dared to attempt againſt the moſt abject ſlave. Or ſhall a court of juſtice carry into execution thoſe malignant ſchemes of perſecution which that proſecutor may dare to frame. He called on the proſecutor, thus pointedly and concluſively refuted, to forbear his attempts and in a free country to permit the preſs, that holy palladium of our rights, to remain free and flouriſhing.

Mr. WILLIAMS then ſtated that this recognizance would operate as a reſtriction of the true liberty of the preſs. He defined the freedom of the preſs to be, a right to publiſh what any one pleaſed, without any previous reſtraint, being anſwerable for ſuch publication.

But, ſaid Mr. WILLIAMS, this recognizance would effectually baniſh Mr. CROSWELL from the profeſſion he has choſen, and deprive his family of bread. He is now called on to enter into a recognizance, himſelf in two thouſand dollars, and his ſureties in one thouſand dollars each, upon each of the indictments. Thus he will be bound in eight thouſand dollars, to be of good behaviour. To forfeit this recognizance, no breach of the peace is neceſſary. Any act, tending to the breach of the peace, is ſufficient. Should, then, Mr. CROSWELL, in purſuing his profeſſion, ſay any thing, however true, tending to derogate from the dignity of Thomas Jefferſon; ſhould he ſimply ſtate that Mr. Jefferſon is a deiſt, his recognizance is forfeited. Nay, ſhould he faithfully repreſent the ſlighteſt miſconduct of the moſt inferior officer in the community; or, if a member of this bar was guilty of the infamous practice of ſwindling, and he ſhould repreſent his conduct to the world—for either of theſe acts, though when convicted by a jury, no court would impoſe a fine of five dollars, he would forfeit his recognizance, and he ſaddled with the enormous ſum of 8000 dollars. Is not this a reſtriction of the preſs? With this recognizance hanging over his head, would he dare to perform his duty? No! he would dare to publiſh nothing, leſt the eagle eye of the proſecutor might ſearch out ſome phraſe which ſome court would determine to be libellous. He would ſtand on the brink of a precipice; and, while ſpeaking the truth, and performing his ſacred duty, he might be plunged head long to ruin, without a trial by jury, for the ſmalleſt poſſible offence. This, Mr. WILLIAMS contended, was levelling all diſtinctions in puniſhments. For the ſmalleſt poſſible offence, the perſon recognized muſt ſuffer the ſame ſeverity of puniſhment, as for the moſt attrocious ſlanders. There was neither juſtice nor reaſon in ſuch doctrine. That all libels from the moſt trivial to the moſt henious, ſhould receive the ſame puniſhment, he contended, was an abſurdity which ought to be, and he had no doubt would be, ſcouted out of court by every honeſt man on the bench.

He contended, that the jury was entitled to judge of the extent of a libel. The trial by jury was guaranteed to every citizen. But if this doctrine prevails, the court takes from the citizen that ſacred privilege, and places his fate in the hands of every magiſtrate. Any magiſtrate had only to bind over a ſuſpected printer, and, in proceſs of time, to declare his bond forfeited; and whatever the nature of the libel may be, the printer is ruined. And, ſaid Mr. WILLIAMS, ſhall we be told that this is no reſtriction of the preſs and of fair diſcuſſion? It is laying the axe at the root of republicaniſm. It is cloſing every avenue of information. And if the attempt meets the ſanction of our courts, I do not ſay too much when I ſpeak my ſolemn conviction that the ſtrongeſt bulwark of human rights is gone forever. Our governors, our magiſtrates, may trample on every right, and the eye of honeſt cenſure will not dare to expoſe their crimes. Peculation, perſecution and immorality, may haſten our country to the great tomb of all republics, and no one will dare to check their wild career. The power of juries are aſſumed by magiſtrates. Thoſe magiſtrates are appointed by the "powers that be." They may become the creatures of power. Every magiſtrate will become, in effect, a licencer. Nothing muſt be publiſhed which might chance to meet his diſapprobation. And thus the old ſtar-chamber policy, at the very mention of which liberty ſhudders, is renewed in the plenitude of its deformity, in every village in the community.

Againſt doctrines pregnant with ſuch conſequences, he conjured the judges to make a reſolute ſtand; nor to ſacrifice, at the ſhrine of party-ſpirit, the victim which the attorney-general had already bound and prepared for the altar. Mr. Williams here cloſed a very able and eloquent argument of an hour and an half, and was followed by Mr. Van Neſs upon the ſame ſide.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

Miscellany.

PROFESSION OF PHILOSOPHIC FAITH.

Tranſlated for the BALANCE, *from the French of a Pupil of* ROSSEAU.

[CONCLUDED.]

O AGE of light! O brilliant ſunſhine of philoſophy! A new day ſprings forth; a divine inſpiration elevates me above myſelf. And I cry out with my maſter we have paſſions and vices—we have nothing but paſſions and vices. The liberty of doing evil is diminiſhed by the laws, we then have no liberty; our conſtitution increaſes abuſe; our education has its defects. It is all corrupted—philoſophers are often deceived—they are always deceived. We have frivolous and pernicious arts. They are all ſo. A ſavage man has ſome conſolation and comfort, of all beings then he is the moſt wiſe and happy. A man who exerciſes his body becomes ſtronger and more robuſt. An inactive man only fond of mediation, is a depraved animal; yes, I repeat it in the face of the world. I hold as inconteſtible all the deciſions of my maſter, and I ſwear that the truth of them is confirmed by his eloquence.

I perceive evil and good neceſſarily blended together in all human things, and I ſay with him that every thing is good in a ſtate of nature, and every thing evil in a ſtate of civil ſociety. Society will be flouriſhing and I will groan. Harmony will reign and I will ſee nothing but diſorder. The people will not have the good ſenſe to return to anarchy and I will have no conſolation. Inſtruction, conſolation and edification will be ſpread by the miniſters of religion and I will not ſee it. The magiſtrates will render juſtice to the people, and I will ſay without ceaſing, that the people are oppreſſed. Science will one day make new diſcoveries, and I will maintain that ſcience does not exiſt. Riches will ſcatter benefits and I will ſupport that they produce nothing but evil. I will ſee innumerable acts of virtue, and will aſſert that there is no virtue. Man will ſeek it inceſſantly and I will declare they hate it. They will add to the number of their natural and civil bonds, and I will affirm that they were deſtined to ſhun and avoid them. Nature affords the materials of all arts and I will affirm that they were deſtined to avoid and ſhun us—the arts are only a corruption of nature. Men uſe thoſe faculties and powers beſtowed upon them by the ſupreme being. They are therefore culpable towards him. They have cultivated the earth. They have thus tranſgreſſed.

And I declare that all men are eſſentially equal. That Achilles and Therſites do not differ in thought, or in courage—that Cataline and Cato, Nero and Titus had preciſely the ſame morals. That dwarfs and giants are preciſely of the ſame ſhape, and that inequality among men has no foundation in nature. I moreover declare that the firſt man, who ſaid to another, I do not deſire the field which you cultivate was a wretch—and that the firſt who ſaid to his equal, I renounce the liberty of killing you was a monſter.

Farther, it is well known that Corneille, Deſcartes, Mallebrance, Fenelon, Paſcal and Rochefocault and other learned men of their day, were free from vice. In conſequence I am well convinced that all our academies are ſhops of thieves and aſſaſſins. That all ſharpers are extremely addicted to letters, and that *Cartouche* was the fineſt genius of his age. This no perſon will deny at this day. For if the ſciences corrupt the morals, the firſt of wretches is inconteſtibly the firſt among the literati. And I will prove if neceſſary that in the ages of ignorance, for example, in the reigns of *Fredegarde* and *Brunchaut*, that the French were virtuous and their morals worthy of the golden age.

I ſolemnly exhort men to deſtroy the race of bees and of beavers, which have given the baneful example of living in ſociety—to butcher without pity the faithful turtle dove, the fatal example of conſtant love; and to extinguiſh the innumerable race of dogs, the infamous models of heroic friendſhip. And we will content ourſelves with imitating the untameable tiger and the roaring lion.

And I affirm with my maſter that the human race for the ſpace of ſix thouſand years, has not produced a ſingle juſt reaſoning—that men have taught and acted conſtantly againſt nature. That the laws are at enmity with man—that I break their yoke—that ſophiſm ought to ſway the ſceptre and reign over the earth till the conſummation of ages.

Such are the principal articles of this heavenly doctrine which I will profeſs until my death; and which if neceſſary I will ſign with my blood. A ſuppliant in heart and in mind I have aſked my maſter, who art thou? He anſwered me, thou ſeeiſt in me, the genius of contradiction, the ſcourge of evidence and the inventor of impoſſible remedies for evils which do not exiſt.

I proſtrate myſelf before him, in expectation that ſome enlightened government will honor him with ſtatues as the Romans did to the fever in their temples.—Amen.

NOTE.

It could be wiſhed that it was poſſible to attack opinions ſo dangerous and ſo extravagant without ceaſing to reſpect the author and to admire the talents of a man of genius, led by imagination to write contrary to the principles of his mind and even the inclinations of his heart. It is our duty to acknowledge that his works contain a multitude of thoughts uſeful as well as virtuous and expreſſed elegantly and ingeniouſly—But the mixture of good only ſerves to render the bad more contagious. Particular conſiderations ought not to be regarded when the very foundations of ſociety are attacked and the moſt uſeful truths ſhaken; when philoſophy is no more than an abſurd and univerſal exaggeration—when an inundation of arbitrary principles which cannot be underſtood, much leſs demonſtrated—bear ſway—when a ſophiſtical affectation of turning ſenſe into nonſenſe, and deluſion into argument exiſts, It is then permitted without doubt to raiſe the voice. The agreſſor of the human race ought to expect ſome repriſals.

AMICUS PLATONI, MAGIS AMICUS VERITATI.

Columbian Congress.

From the Gazette of the United States.

INTERESTING DEBATE

In the houſe of repreſentatives, on the reſolution of Mr. Griswold, calling for information relative to the ceſſion of Louiſiana to France.

Mr. Griſwold [Federaliſt] moved that the following reſolution, which he had laid upon the table be now conſidered:

Reſolved, That the preſident of the United States be requeſted to direct the proper officer to lay before this houſe copies of ſuch official documents as have been received by this government, announcing the ceſſion of Louiſiana to France, together with a report explaining the ſtipulations, circumſtances and conditions under which that province is to be delivered up, unleſs ſuch documents and report will, in the opinion of the preſident, divulge to the houſe particular tranſactions, not proper at this time to be communicated.

The houſe divided upon the motion to conſider the report. It was carried in the affirmative, ayes 35, noes 32.

Mr. Randolph [Democrat] ſaid the diſcuſſion of that reſolution would involve a

ſubject nearly connected with one which had ariſen out of the preſident's meſſage relative to New-Orleans, which had been recently diſcuſſed with cloſed doors. He ſhould therefore move, that the reſolution be referred to a committee of the whole houſe, on the ſtate of the union, to whom was referred the meſſage of the preſident relative to New-Orleans.

Mr. Speaker ſaid the motion was not in order. No ſuch meſſage is mentioned on the journals, and it does not appear that the committee of the whole on the ſtate of the union have any ſuch ſubject before them. Beſides, all references to the committee of the whole on the ſtate of the union ſhould be made *general*.

Mr. Randolph modified his motion, and moved that the reſolution be referred to a committee of the whole on the ſtate of the union.

Mr. Griſwold. I hope, ſir, the motion will not prevail. This reſolution relates to a public tranſaction, a tranſaction mentioned on your public journals. Why ſhould you keep ſecret from the people your proceedings upon a ſubject of ſuch vaſt importance to the public? What is there, what can there be in a diſcuſſion of this reſolution, which is improper to be known? If the information itſelf, when obtained, ſhould be of a private or confidential nature, it will not be diſcloſed. But certainly there can be nothing of ſecrecy in the queſtion, whether we ſhall aſk what that information is. No one will ſay that the papers aſked for by the reſolution are not important to the legiſlature and to the people of this country. Does not the preſident ſpeak of the ſubject as an important one, as one which ought to have weight in the deliberations of Congreſs, as one which may become a ſubject of legiſlation? He ſays, "The ceſſion of the Spaniſh province of Louiſiana to France, which took place in the courſe of the late war, will if carried into effect, make a change in the aſpect of our foreign relations; and will doubtleſs have juſt weight in any deliberations of the legiſlature connected with that ſubject." Here the preſident ſpeaks of the fact as officially known; he ſays it will make a change in the aſpect of our foreign relations, and that it will have weight in our deliberations. How can it have weight unleſs we obtain the information aſked for? Shall we undertake to legiſlate in the dark upon a ſubject which the preſident has declared to be of ſuch importance? If the information which ſhall be communicated is not proper to be publickly known, the preſident will ſay that it is confidential, and the houſe will conſider it with cloſed doors; but no one can deny, after what the preſident has ſaid in his meſſage, that congreſs ought to poſſeſs this information, and all the information which can be given upon a ſubject ſo intereſting to the nation. Why then delay the ſubject till a future day? Gentlemen do not intend to deny us this information, why delay it by unneceſſarily referring the reſolution to a committee. The ſeſſion is rapidly wearing away, more than one third of it is already paſſed; it muſt cloſe on the 3d of March. It is important that we ſhould obtain this information and that we ſhould obtain it ſpeedily, that we may have time to conſider it and to legiſlate upon it. Sir, I will venture to ſay that no ſubject equally important or equally intereſting to the people, will come before us this ſeſſion. Why then do gentlemen wiſh to keep it off? Why throw embarraſſments in the way and attempt to make a queſtion where there can be no queſtion. There is no queſtion, there can be none, as to the propriety of making this requeſt.

Mr. Randolph ſaid he felt a total diſinclination to go into a diſcuſſion of the ſubject of the reſolution with open doors; and whatever might be his own feelings, and whatever his ſolicitude to ſatisfy the genman from Connecticut, he ſhould not indulge them ſo far as to ſtate in public on a preliminary queſtion, thoſe reaſons which he had already refuſed to ſtate in public on the merits of the reſolution. The gentleman, ſaid Mr. Randolph, ſeemed to inſinuate, that by refuſing to adopt the preſent motion, we refuſe the information. I deny that this is a refuſal of the information. What I ſtate is, that I have arguments of a private nature which I wiſh to offer upon a diſcuſſion of that reſolution, and unleſs I can be heard in private I am precluded from offering thoſe arguments. I have not ſaid, that I ſhall ultimately vote againſt the reſolution. Nay I will ſtate that I came into the houſe this morning, with an intention to call for the order of the day, that the houſe reſolve itſelf into a committee of the whole on the ſtate of the Union, for the purpoſe of moving ſeveral reſolutions on the ſubject of New-Orleans, and the ſecret communication of the Preſident; and if the gentleman would permit me, I would now make that motion.

Mr. Rutledge. [Federal] If I thought the requeſt propoſed by the reſolution could in any way embarraſs the executive or interfere with any exiſting negociation, I would be the laſt perſon in the houſe to make the requeſt. I do not perceive that any embarraſſment can poſſibly be produced by it. What do we aſk for in this reſolution? We ſimply aſk of the Preſident information relative to an important fact which he has publicly ſtated to be a fact. It is reaſonable and important that this information ſhould be obtained. It has for many months been ſtated in the public papers of Europe and America, that the province of Louiſiana has been ceded to France. It has long ſince been publicly ſpoken of in the Britiſh parliament: yet the legiſlature of the United States has received no official information that ſuch a ceſſion has been made, unleſs, indeed, the ſlight mention of the fact by the Preſident may be conſidered as official information. He ſtates that the ceſſion has been made, and ſpeaks of it as important to the United States, as making a change in the aſpect of our foreign relations, and as demanding the attention of the legiſlature; yet we know nothing of the particulars and circumſtances of this tranſaction, which is as important to the people of this country as any I can conceive, and about which, if this motion prevails, they will be kept totally in the dark. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Randolph), fears that the diſcuſſion will involve ſubjects which ought to be kept ſecret: he is apprehenſive that the merits of the queſtion will be brought into view in the diſcuſſion of the reſolution. Sir, no limits of diſcuſſion can embrace the merits. The queſtion is ſimply, ſhall we aſk for the information? If the reſolution is adopted, the Preſident is not even requeſted to diſcloſe any fact which, in his opinion, ought not to be known by the houſe. If he ſhould make a communication of facts, the knowledge of which ought to be confined to the legiſlature, he will give us notice that the communication if confidential; the doors of the honſe will be ſhut, and I will anſwer for myſelf and my friends that the information will not be diſcloſed.—Sir, I can ſee no good reaſon why we ſhould go into a committee of the whole to diſcuſs this queſtion, when it has been uſual to decide ſimilar queſtions in the houſe where information has been deſired. I ſhall give my vote againſt the motion.

Mr. S. Smith [Democrat] ſaid no gentleman had expreſſed any unwillingneſs to receive or to call for this information contemplated by the reſolution. The only objection ſtated, was to a diſcuſſion at the preſent time, and in this particular mode. It was well known, that there were ſubjects of a ſimilar nature, referred to a committee of the whole on the ſtate of the union. If gentlemen would conſent to go into a committee and take up thoſe ſubjects, they might all be conſidered at the ſame time. He did not know but the houſe would be unanimous in adopting the reſolution, if brought forward at a proper time, and in a proper manner.—He recollected that when a call for papers was made relative to the Britiſh treaty, certain gentlemen objected to the call becauſe it was ſtated, that a negociation might be pending, and that a call for papers under ſuch circumſtances, would be improper; whether a negociation might not now he pending, he could not ſay. He knew, however, that the reſolution in the caſe juſt

mentioned, was referred to a committee of the whole houſe, and that had been the invariable practice in ſuch caſes.

Mr. Dana [Federaliſt] had heard no intimation that any negociation reſpecting the ceſſion of Louiſiana to France is pending. He pretended not to be in the ſecrets of the cabinet: but he had underſtood, that the negociation had been completed, in the courſe of the late war. The fact was ſo ſtated by the preſident, and he had never heard it contradicted. Though the preſident had ſtated the ſimple fact, that ſuch a ceſſion bad been made, and had called the attention of the legiſlature to the ſubject, he had not given ſuch information as could guide their deliberations.—Beſides the ſimple fact, it was important to know, whether Louiſiana was ceded to France according to its limits as defined, in 1763, by the treaty of Paris, or according to the extent anciently claimed by France. It was alſo important to know, whether it was expreſsly agreed to be holden by France, ſubject to the ſtipulations contained in our treaty with Spain, or to be holden in the ſame condition as it might be in at the time of delivering it up.

Mr. Griſwold called for the yeas and nays upon the queſtion.

Mr. Smilie [Demo.] was in favour of the motion.—He well remembered, that when a reſolution was before the houſe calling for information reſpecting the Britiſh treaty, that reſolution was referred to a committee of the whole houſe, and he thought this ought to take the ſame courſe.

Mr. Davis [Democrat] ſaid as the yeas and nays had been called for, it became his duty to ſtate the reaſons for the vote which he ſhould give, and to declare to the world the motives by which he was actuated. He ſaid the houſe was called upon by the executive to deliberate upon a ſubject of great national importance, and one in which the people of the weſtern country are particularly intereſted. Had not the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Randolph) ſuggeſted his intention to move immediately to go into committee to conſider the Preſident's Meſſage relative to the ſhutting of the port of New-Orleans, he was not certain how he ſhould have voted upon the preſent queſtion. He had now reſolved to vote againſt it. He thought the information aſked for by this reſolution neceſſary to enable the houſe to act underſtandingly upon the ſubject; he was therefore oppoſed to any delay in procuring the information. He wiſh d to know of gentlemen what was to be g ined by referring the reſolution to a committee. If the ſubject needed diſcuſſion it might be diſcuſſed in the houſe and without delay. No gentleman would ſay that he expected to derive the information called for from any diſcuſſion which could be given to the reſolution. The gentleman from Virginia ſays, that we are now prepared to proceed to the conſideration of the preſident's confidential meſſage, and that we may at the ſame time conſider this reſolution. Sir, ſays Mr. Davis, that gentleman may be prepared for this but I am not. So far from being prepared to proceed upon that ſubject before I act upon this reſolution, I want this information to enable me to act underſtandingly upon that ſubject. That gentleman may have all the information which he could wiſh: I have not. Some gentlemen may poſſeſs means of deriving ſecret information from the cabinet: I have none. I ſhall give my vote, ſir, againſt refering the reſolution to a committee.

Mr. Randolph ſaid he poſſeſſed no information upon the ſubject but what any gentleman might obtain if he choſe.

Mr. Huger. Mr. Speaker, I confeſs I cannot underſtand the objections of the gentlemen who oppoſe the adoption of this reſolution. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Randolph) profeſſes to have no objections to calling for the information, and yet inſiſts that it ſhall not be called for unleſs in a ſecret committee with cloſed doors. What can be his object in this? If there be no objection to our calling for the information and indeed if it be proper to do ſo at all, it is certainly proper to call for it publicly. No ſecret of the goverment can be diſcloſed by the adoption of the reſolution, for the information to be given is left diſcretionary with the executive. Reference has been made to the adoption of a reſolution calling upon the executive for papers relative to the Britiſh treaty. I was not a member of the houſe at the time when that reſolution was adopted; but if I rightly underſtand the ſubject, the principles of that reſolution were very different from thoſe of the preſent. That reſolution related to a negociation between our own government and a foreign power. Papers, it was underſtood, were to be demanded from the executive as a right, and to effect a particular end, which was deemed in its eſſence unconſtitutional. The call for papers was conſequently oppoſed, as unneceſſary and improper. The preſent reſolution on the contrary, calls for information relating to a tranſaction, which has taken place between two foreign countries upwards of twelve months ago. No one however, doubts but that the probable conſequences of this tranſaction muſt deeply affect the intereſts of the United States, nor does nor can any gentleman deny but that it is equally neceſſary and proper, that the repreſentatives of the nation ſhould receive the earlieſt and moſt correct information on the ſubject. What mode then more correct or proper than that adopted by the gentleman from Connecticut to obtain this information, This reſolution is drawn in the moſt cautious and reſpectful terms, it aſks for no information but ſuch as may, in the opinion of the executive, be given with perfect propriety.

The ſubject is of vaſt importance to the nation and one in which the poople at large feel deeply intereſted. My colleague (Mr. Rutledge) has very properly remarked, that it has for twelve months been a ſubject of public notoriety in Europe and America, and yet the legiſlature of the Union remains in profound ignorance of it. Sir, I have felt, and do feel, great ſurpriſe that the documents relative to this tranſaction have not, before this been laid before congreſs. I pretend not to be as well acquainted with the concerns of the cabinet as ſome gentlemen who ſuggeſt that there may be ſome negociation pending which may render it improper to diſcloſe the information aſked for. I can however, conceive of no negotiation, that can be affected by the information requeſted, but if any exiſts the preſident will ſo inform us, and that will be a ſatisfactory reaſon for not making the diſcloſure. If this related to a tranſaction between our own government and a foreign nation, it would be rational to ſuppoſe that there might be circumſtances attending it which it would not be proper to make public before the negociation was finally cloſed. But that is not the caſe. It is a tranſaction which has taken place between two foreign nations: a tranſaction which involves our intereſts, and in which we have had no agency. The feelings of the nation are alive upon this ſubject—the people are alarmed and will not, nay they ought not to be ſatisfied unleſs ſomething is done. They properly conſider the ſubject as a very important one and they are entitled to information reſpecting it. If there is any thing in the information which in its nature is improper to be publiſhed, the preſident will ſay ſo, and it will be ſome ſatisfaction to know that ſuch a reaſon exiſts. If there is any negociation pending, which would render a diſcloſure of the information improper, a ſtatement of the fact will be a ſatisfactory anſwer from the preſident.

Mr. Smilie thought it very extraordinary that this motion ſhould meet with oppoſition from the quarter from which it comes. He could not ſee any reaſon for gentlemen refuſing to follow an example which they themſelves had ſet in the caſe of a call for papers on the Britiſh treaty. He was very certain that the reſolution upon that ſubject was referred to a committee of the whole: Beſides, he well remembered that the gentlemen who now bring forward and ſupport the reſolution calling upon the executive for papers then denied the right of the houſe to make ſuch a call. He thought there was ſomething extraordinary in this.

Mr. Gregg ſaid no perſon could deny that this was a very important reſolution and deſerved a full and free diſcuſſion. It was the firſt time that he had heard any objection againſt referring an important reſolution to a committee of the whole. He thought it the ordinary courſe of ſuch buſineſs, and the courſe which ought to be purſued in the preſent inſtance.

Mr. Griſwold ſaid, if the object of the preſent motion had been to give opportunity for a more free diſcuſſion of the reſolution than it could receive in the houſe, he ſhould not have the leaſt objection to the reference. He was willing it ſhould be diſcuſſed with all the freedom that any gentleman could wiſh. It ſeemed to be the ideas of the gentleman from Pennſylvania, laſt up, that this was the ſole object of the motion. The gentleman muſt certainly be miſtaken. The motion is for a reference to a *ſecret* committee on the ſtate of the union, a committee in which the reſolution may be rejected without the neceſſity of giving any reaſon for the rejection: the information may be denied, and the world can never know why or by whom. For this reaſon I object to the motion, and not becauſe I am unwilling to afford an opportunity for a full and free diſcuſſion. Another gentleman from Pennſylvania (Mr. Smilie) ſays that the courſe now propoſed was adopted in the caſe of the reſolution calling for papers relative to the Britiſh treaty, and at the inſtance of ſome of the gentlemen who now oppoſe this motion. It is true, ſir, that reſolution was referred to a committee of the whole; but it was not to a committee of the whole on the ſtate of the union; it was not to a *ſecret* committee. That reſolution was publicly diſcuſſed, and gentlemen did not ſhrink from aſſigning, before the world, their reſon for the conduct. If gentlemen will take the ſame courſe now, I have not the leaſt objection; I will conſent to go immediately into committee of the whole, and if gentlemen are of opinion that the reſolution requires diſcuſſion, I ſhould think that the moſt proper mode of proceeding; but let the tranſaction be public. If gentlemen intend to allow us the information, they can have no objection to allow it publicly; if they intend to deny it, the public ought to know their reaſons for the denial. It is in vain for the gentlemen to ſay that the reſolution may involve matters of ſecrecy: there can nothing of ſecrecy ariſe out of it: it is compriſed in a ſimple queſtion —ſhall we have the information? Who can ſay that there is any thing of ſecrecy in this? I repeat, if gentlemen will deny us the information, let them deny it openly, in the face of the country, and let the country judge of the propriety of the denial, and do not let them ſend us to a *ſecret* committee, and there make the denial for reaſons which never can be known, or for no reaſon at all.

[Debate to be concluded in our next.]

Be it our weekly task,
To note the paſſing tidings of the times.

Hudson, *February* 1, 1803.

The Rev. TIMOTHY ALDEN, one of the miſſionaries, appointed for the purpoſe of ſoliciting benefactions for the relief of the ſufferers by the late diſtreſſing fire at Portſmouth, N. H. is now in this city. A ſubſcription has been begun, and there is reaſon to hope that a ſum not unworthy of the opulence and humanity of the citizens of Hudſon, will be collected.

The ſtate Legiſlature met on Tueſday laſt. —The Aſſembly made choice of THOMAS STORM, Speaker—SOLOMON SOUTHWICK, Clerk—and EPHRAIM HUNT, Sergeant at Arms.—The Senate made choice of H. I. BLEECKER, Eſq. Clerk.——The Governor's Speech will be publiſhed in our next.

A memorial has been in circulation in the Weſtern country to be preſented to the Preſident and Congreſs, on the ſubject of the late infraction of the Spaniſh treaty, at New-Orleans. The memorial is couched in bold and manly language, and ſerves to ſhew with how much indignation the weſtern people muſt obſerve the trifling and puſillanimous conduct of our government towards the Spaniards.—The memorialiſts ſtate, that they owe the United States arrears of exciſe, and other debts and taxes, and have no means to diſcharge thoſe demands, but the produce of their farms. That, ſhut out, as they are, from a market for their produce in the eaſt, it muſt rot on their hands, unleſs the government receive it from them, at a reaſonable price, or protect them in the proſecution of a lawful trade. That, in their opinion, prompt and deciſive meaſures are neceſſary, and that they rely on the *immediate* interpoſition of the United States.—They declare that they have *a right to demand*, and *do demand* that the government either adopt ſuch meaſures as will ſecure them in the proſecution of their commerce, take their produce from them at a reaſonable price, or otherwiſe relieve them from contributions of any kind whatever.—They cloſe by obſerving, that imperious neceſſity may *compel* them, unleſs relief is afforded, to *reſort to meaſures which they may deem calculated to enſure protection to their trade, though they may reſult in conſequences unfavorable to the harmony of the Union.*

PROGRESS OF VILLAINY.

A moſt extraordinary attempt has lately been made to break into the vaults of the Bank of South-Carolina. The robber, it appears, had entered a drain under one of the ſtreets, which had been opened for the purpoſe of cleaning. From this he had dug his way to the walls of the vault, thro' which he was endeavoring to penetrate, by means of a chiſſel and mallet, when he was diſcovered. Aſtoniſhing as it may ſeem, this daring adventurer had been immured in his ſubterraneous paſſage nearly three months, without having once ſeen the light of the ſun. He had received his proviſions, conſiſting of bread and cheeſe, in the night time, from his accomplices, through a grate of the drain. He ſaid he had been driven to this deſperate act by loſſes at the *gaming table*!—An awful warning!

CONSPIRACY.

By a late arrival at Charleſton, from London, intelligence is received of the diſcovery of a conſpiracy which was firſt ſaid to be of a treaſonable nature, and to have for view nothing leſs than the murder of the king, ſeizing of the tower, and with the arms depoſited there, the taking poſſeſſion of the bank. On examination, however, no evidence appeared of plotting againſt the life of his majeſty, or of ſeizing the tower, bank &c but of ſeducing ſome of the guards from their duty and allegiance. A great number of the conſpirators, with their leader, Col. Deſpard, were committed to priſon. The examination was going on when the laſt accounts left England.

The Knot.

MARRIED,

On Thursday last, at the Friend's Meeting-house, Mr. WILLIAM SHIPLEY, of Pleasant Valley (Dutchess county) to Miss PHEBE COMSTOCK, daughter of Thomas Comstock, of this city.

Mr. HOLT,

If your reply to me had been civil, I should have returned the civility; but your *railings* are far beneath my notice.

EZRA SAMPSON.

January 25th.

☞ Sundry "Cloſet" articles, prepared for this paper, are poſtponed for want of room.

The Wreath.

FOR THE BALANCE.

A COMPARISON.

NOW cheering autumn leaves the plain,
And dark December's gloomy reign
Commences o'er our land;
No more the fanning zephyrs blow,
The bubbling fountains cease to flow
At winter's loud command.
The beardless rocks—the naked trees,
And fading turf declare,
They shrink before the shivering breeze,
Beneath the piercing air.
Ah! who can view
The sad adieu
Of nature, without pain;
Who would not here,
Indulge a tear,
And wish her back again.

Cold as December's wintry skies,
And dreary, all my prospects rise;
Oh! when will genial spring,
With smiles allay stern winter's wrath,
And strew with flowers my thorny path,
And new enjoyments bring.
The sunshine of my early days
No more illumes my way;
But clouds obscure the vernal rays,
And chase their light away.
Kind hope to thee
I bend the knee,
Imploring still thy aid,
Leave not this breast
Devoid of rest,
Where grief too long has prey'd.

JULIENNE.

Kingston, Ulster County, Dec. 1802.

FOR THE BALANCE.

SONNET to LOVE.

SWEET madd'ning charmer, leave this troubled breast,
Disturb no more the tranquil hours of life;
While lasts this phrenzy how can I be blest?
Depart, and still this tort'ring mental strife.

Thy angel-pow'r with rapture fills the mind,
When thy soft passion meets a kind return;
But when despis'd, in thee no bliss we find,
Then fires of anguish in the bosom burn;

Bright hope departs, despair's dark night prevails,
And troubled fancy dreams of nought but woe;
On mis'ry's tide life's shatter'd vessel sails,
And in the gulph of sorrow plunges low!

One partial glance from lovely HARRIET's eyes
Dispels each care, and bids hope's visions rise.

PHILANDER.

December 10th, 1802.

Agricultural.

From EATON's Survey of the Turkish Empire.

THE MODE OF PRESERVING BUTTER, IN TURKEY.

"THE butter, which is moſtly uſed in Conſtantinople, comes from the *Crim* and the *Cuban*. They do not ſalt it, but melt it in large copper pans over a ſlow fire, and ſcum off what riſes; it will then preſerve ſweet for a long time, if the butter was freſh when it was melted. We preſerve butter moſtly by ſalting. I have had butter, which, when freſh, was melted and ſcummed in the Tartar manner, and then ſalted in our manner, which kept, two years, good and fine taſted.

Waſhing does not ſo intirely free butter from the curd and butter-milk, which it is neceſſary to do in order to preſerve it, as boiling and melting; when, then, ſalt is added to prevent the pure butyrous part from growing rancid, we certainly have the beſt proceſs for preſerving butter. The melting or boiling, if done with care, does not diſcolour or injure the taſte."

Monitorial Department.

To aid the cause of virtue and religion.

FOR THE BALANCE.

DOCUMENTS CONCERNING THE EXISTENCE OF NOAH's DELUGE.

To the EDITORS OF THE BALANCE,

AS the moſt ſtrenuous exertions have been made to invalidate the ſcripture hiſtory of Noah's flood, I ſhall at ſeveral times, communicate to you for publication, a *few* from among the numerous facts, which have appeared in corroboration of that important piece of ſacred hiſtory: and perhaps it might not be improper to publiſh my communications on this ſubject, under your monitorial head.

W.

Among the various testimonies of tradition and ancient history, in proof of the existence of the deluge, called Noah's flood, is the following, which is mentioned by BARNARDIN ST. PIERRE.

"I find (ſays St. Pierre) this hiſtorical teſtimony in the hiſtory of China by father Martini, Book 1."

"During the reign of Yaus, the ſeventh emperor, the annals of the country relate, that for ſix days together the ſun never ſet, ſo that a general conflagration was apprehended. The reſult, on the contrary, was a deluge, which inundated the whole of China. The epoch of this Chineſe deluge, and that of the univerſal deluge, are in the ſame century. Yaus was born (according to the Chineſe Chronology) two thouſand three hundred and ſeven years before Chriſt; and the univerſal deluge happened, according to the Hebrew computation, two thouſand three hundred and forty years before the ſame epoch."

TERMS OF THE BALANCE.

To City Subscribers, Two Dollars and fifty cents, payable in quarterly advances.

To Country Subscribers, who receive their papers at the office, Two Dollars, payable as above.

To those who receive them by the mail, Two Dollars, exclusive of postage, payable in advance.

A handsome title-page, with an Index or Table of Contents, will be given with the last number of each volume.

Advertisements inserted in a conspicuous and handsome manner, in the *Advertiser* which accompanies, and circulates as extensively as the Balance.

Complete files of the first volume, which have been reserved in good order for binding, are for sale—Price of the volume, bound, Two Dollars and fifty cents—unbound, Two Dollars. The whole may be sent, stitched or in bundles, to any post-office in the state, for 52 cents postage; or to any post-office in the union for 78 cents.

PUBLISHED BY
SAMPSON, CHITTENDEN & CROSWELL,
Warren-Street, Hudson.
WHERE PRINTING IN GENERAL IS EXECUTED WITH ELEGANCE AND ACCURACY.